

II. Remarks

In response to the Office Action of 9 January 2008, the Examiner is requested to reconsider the application in view of the remarks set forth below.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has correctly notes the continued examination under 37 C.F.R. Sec. 1.114, and that Applicant's submission filed on October 11, 2007, has been entered. In the Continuation of Disposition of Claims for page 1 of the Office Action, there is a listing of pending and withdrawn claims. However, the listing is inconsistent with the submission and the restriction requirement. The listing states that claim 169 has been withdrawn, but claim 169 is pending; claim 165 has been withdrawn. The listing also states that claims 818-844 are pending, but claims 818-844 have been withdrawn. Further, claim 591 previously had a duplicate, and one of the duplicates was cancelled, while the other remains pending. Compare the restriction requirement with Applicant's filing of October 11, 2007, and the claim charts.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that the copy of the IDS is not legible, and thus it has not been considered. In order to aide the Examiner's handling of this application, Applicant has typed a new copy that is submitted herewith. Applicant again apologizes for the amount of art arising in the settled litigation, and this art has been filed out of an abundance of caution. Applicant again offers to fly to Washington DC or do whatever Applicant can do to ease the Examiner's handling of this application.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has expressed appreciation for the claim charts. Again, Applicant is willing to do whatever Applicant can do to ease the Examiner's handling of this application.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has graciously provided a copy of 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103. Applicant appreciates the consideration.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has graciously provided a summary

for determining obviousness pursuant to *Deere*. Applicant appreciates the consideration.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-168, 170-291, 299, 309-366, 376-408, 410-502, 504-519, 521-536, 538-553, 556-570, 572-590, 592-598, 60-631, 726-754, 818-861, 876-878, 890-892, 897-900, 904-909, 911-916, 919, 948, 953-976, and 978-995 have been rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103. Generally, the Examiner has contended that these claims are obvious over Brown in view of Tang for reasons more precisely stated in the Office Action.

In response, the rejection is respectfully traversed, and further explanation or allowance is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that a proper reason to combine has not been made out, subject to the Examiner's further information, and Applicant respectfully requests a more detailed explanation of the rejection, if it is maintained (pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 132, "the reasons for such rejection... together with such information as may be useful in judging the propriety of continuing prosecution...").

The Examiner contends at page 4 of the Office Action that Brown taught a content object at Column 16, lines 52-54, and that Tang taught the content object is a pointer, video, audio, a graphic, or multimedia at Column 9, lines 38-44, 51-55. The Examiner also contends that there was a reason to combine these to reach Applicant's claimed invention. However, at the cited portion of Brown, and further at Column 16, line 62, the content object appears to be an access control. The Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to Brown's figures 3B and particularly 4B and the corresponding text to confirm that the meaning of content for the object in Brown correspond to access control.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 132, the Examiner's information is requested regarding how Brown or Tang would be operable if Brown's access control were to be replaced with Tang's contended "a pointer, video, audio, a graphic, or multimedia." Subject to the Examiner's information, Applicant contends that a proper reason to combine has not been stated, at least because the proposed modification or combination would render the references inoperable for

their respective purposes, the references contradict or teach away from the Examiner's proposed modification, and if the modification were carried out, it would change the principles of operation of the cited references. Further, the combination would not result in Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, a prima facie case of statutory obviousness has not been made out.

With respect to the present application, the Applicant hereby rescinds any disclaimer of claim scope made in the parent application or any predecessor or related application. The Examiner is advised that any previous disclaimer, if any, and the prior art that it was made to avoid, may need to be revisited. Nor should a disclaimer, if any, in the present application be read back into any predecessor or related application.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is requested. If the prosecution of this case can be in any way advanced by a telephone discussion or by a personal interview, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (312) 240-0824.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the above-identified patent application or credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-0235, and if any extension of time is needed, this shall be deemed a petition therefor. Please direct all communication to the undersigned at the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 8, 2008

Peter K. Trzyna
(Reg. No. 32,601)
(Customer No. 28910)

P. O. Box 7131
Chicago, Illinois 60680-7131
(312) 240-0824